Innovative Fuel Transfer Technology
Teleconference June 2, 2010 – 10:00 A.M. PT

Firs Meeting
The first meeting of the Innovative Fuel Transfer Technology Group met on June 2, 2010 in conference call. Participants of this first meeting included:

LaMar Mitchell	CARB
Marci Christofferson	CARB
Rosa Lopez	CARB
Jason McPhee	CARB
Whitney Okabayashi	CARB
Xu Wang	CARB
Fred Voss	Voss Intellectual Property, LLC
Mark Bonner	Fuel Transfer Technologies, Inc.
Gary Underhill	Fuel Transfer Technologies, Inc.
James Wederburn	Fuel Transfer Technologies, Inc.
Rick Auffrey	Fuel Transfer Technologies, Inc.
Mike McAvey	McAvey Ventures, LLC
Dan Weibel	Blitz U.S.A.
Leann Ehler	Blitz U.S.A.
Pete Moyer	Blitz U.S.A.
Charley Forbis	Blitz U.S.A.
David Jones	Scepter Corporation
Phil Monckton	Scepter Corporation
John Ferguson	Scepter Corporation
Andy Meloeny	Testing Services Group
Bob Schmitd	Testing Services Group
Paul von Mohr	Meo Mio, LLC

For the purposes of this document, all comments made by representatives of ARB will be attributed to ARB staff or staff and comments made by all others will be attributed to industry representatives.

ARB staff provided some background on the current technology for vapor recovery. A PowerPoint presentation providing a basic description of vapor recovery has been posted to our webpage located at http://www.arb.ca.gov/consprod/fuel-containers/fueltransfer/presentation/presentation.htm

Current vapor recovery technology is focused on the gasoline stream as it pertains to on-road motor vehicles. Stage I or Phase I vapor recovery controls gasoline vapors during the transfer of gasoline from the cargo tank into the storage tank at the gasoline dispensing facility (GDF). Stage II or Phase II vapor recovery controls gasoline vapors during the transfer of gasoline from the GDF to the vehicle fuel tank.

This first meeting focused on problem identification, and participant expectations.

Two primary problems were identified: loss of gasoline vapor during the transfer of gasoline from the GDF into objects not compatible with current vapor recovery equipment such as portable fuel containers and stations (PFC and PFS), motorcycles, boats, etc. and loss of liquid gasoline identified as spillage during the filling of the PFC or PFS and while pouring gasoline from the PFC into other equipment. This discussion dealt primarily with PFC and PFS and touched on motorcycles as areas that need attention.

Possible solutions to these problems that were discussed included changes to the design of the PFC, changes to the design of the receiver port which would involve a standardization effort, and changes to the GDF equipment.

ARB staff recognizes solutions to these problems may require a time frame that stretches ten years into the future to become fully implemented but would like industry representatives to think in a shorter time frame.

When ARB staff asked if regulations or the existing market might be impediments to developing and implementing solutions to these problems the consensus seemed to be that both would be impediments. Staff offered to act as a facilitator/coordinator between other divisions within ARB and with other agencies.

When ARB staff asked about challenges the existing market poses, industry talked about the different receiving ports on the equipment. A lack of standardized receiving ports was identified as an impediment to obvious solutions to the spillage during pouring.

A second meeting will be scheduled in late August or early September to further discuss the goals and challenges associated with reducing spillage and displaced vapors.